

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found at least at page 6, lines 2-9 of Applicants' specification. No new matter is added. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 stands withdrawn. Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and therefore should be rejoined and allowed upon the allowance of claim 1.

The Office Action, on page 4, objects to claim 1 for an informality. Claim 1 is amended to obviate this objection.

The Office Action, on page 4, rejects claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,774,935 to Morimoto et al. ("Morimoto") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,624 to Kuno. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Morimoto is directed to a digital camera that includes a connector for connecting another digital camera and an interface for exchanging data between the digital camera and the other digital camera (Abstract). The Office Action asserts that Morimoto teaches many of the features recited in independent claim 1. The Office Action concedes that Morimoto fails to teach that when the first digital camera detects the instruction about taking a photograph from the first controller while the first digital camera is controlled by the second controller, the first digital camera stores the instruction about taking a photograph from the first controller, which is stored in the first digital camera, and only executes the instruction in the first controller after completion of the control of the first digital camera by the second controller. Rather, the Office Action relies on Kuno, in its disclosure of an image input system, to make up for this shortfall.

Kuno is directed to an image input system in which a plurality of users can perform remote operation (col. 1, lines 7-8). The Office Action asserts that Kuno, at col. 6, lines 1-23,

teaches features that can be considered to correspond to the claimed instruction about taking a photograph. The Office Action further asserts that it would have been obvious to have combined Kuno with Morimoto to execute control instructions received by the first controller taught by Morimoto after completion of control by the second controller as taught by Kuno for benefit of appropriately managing control privileges of a digital camera, and thus preventing operational conflicts.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, that the instruction about taking the photograph is at least one of an exposure condition to take the photograph, a light metering to take the photograph, White Balance (WB) condition to take the photograph, a shooting lens positioned to take the photograph, a zoom lens position to take the photograph, a shutter speed to take the photograph, an aperture value to take the photograph, chromaticness to take the photograph, a shooting sensitivity to take the photograph, edge enhancement value to take the photograph, a compression ratio to take the photograph, a number of recording pixels to take the photograph and a time setting to take the photograph.

Kuno, in step S9 of Fig. 5, merely teaches that a client ID is added to the camera control queue. The client ID, however, cannot reasonably be considered to correspond to any of the specific instructions recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reason, no combination of Kuno with Morimoto would have rendered obvious the combination of all of the features recited in independent claim 1. Further, dependent claims 3 and 4 would also not have been rendered obvious for at least the dependence of these claims on independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Morimoto in view of Kuno are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3 and 4, and rejoinder and allowance of claim 2, are earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Michael J. Steger
Registration No. 66,034

MAC:MJS/cfr

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time
Request for Continued Examination

Date: May 14, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
